

NOTE ON *CYPRINA ISLANDICA*.

By Dr. WM. H. DALL.

Read 13th December, 1912.

ON p. 105 of the Proceedings of the Malacological Society's current volume, Mr. E. A. Smith discusses the generic name of the *Venus islandica*, L., and incidentally points out that the species figured on pl. 301, figs. 1a-b, of the Encyclopédie Méthodique does not represent that species, as I had assumed, but was taken from a specimen of *Batissa*. A comparison shows that Mr. Smith is quite right in this identification, but I may perhaps be granted a few lines to show that I erred in good company.

The figure is sufficiently like *C. islandica* to deceive anyone whose attention is not especially called to the discrepancies, but apart from that, the circumstances which chiefly misled me are the facts that Lamarek himself in 1806<sup>1</sup> and 1818,<sup>2</sup> Bory St. Vincent in 1827,<sup>3</sup> and Deshayes in 1835,<sup>4</sup> all unite in referring these figures to *Cyprina islandica*.

That Lamarek in 1799 selected another species as an example of the genus would not oblige us to take it as the type, since *Cyclas cornea* was not included in the species figured by Bruguière a year earlier under the name *Cyclas*, and consequently could not serve as the type, even if it had not had a generic name given to it by Scopoli many years before.

No one would be better pleased than I if the name *Cyprina* could be preserved, but I fear that the rules would have to be strained a little to do it. The name of the carp (*Cyprinus*) is doubtless derived from its popular allocation as the fish of Venus by the ancients. On the other hand, the binomiality of Moehring's bird-names<sup>5</sup> can hardly be maintained as against the properly proposed *Arctica* of Schumacher.

Again, since Link's use of the name *Cyclas* is inadmissible and the other forms figured by Bruguière had been pre-empted for new genera, it becomes a moot question whether *Batissa*, Gray, as the last-proposed name for any of the group, should not give way to *Cyclas*; since, if there was anything in the group available for a generic name after the elimination of *Sphærium*, *Cyrena*, and *Corbicula*, it would be entitled to hold the earlier name.

<sup>1</sup> Ann. Mus. Nat. Hist. Paris, vol. vii, p. 420, 1806.

<sup>2</sup> Anim. sans Vert., vol. v, p. 557, 1818 (in synonymy).

<sup>3</sup> Tab. Encycl. Méth. Vers., 1827, p. 156.

<sup>4</sup> Anim. sans Vert., ed. Deshayes, vol. vi, p. 290, 1835 (in synonymy).

<sup>5</sup> Moehring's work, *Avium Genera*, was published in 1752, and therefore, being pre-Linnean, is not admissible in zoology. The Dutch translation, however, *with additions*, by Nozeman & Vosmaer, is dated 1758, the same year as the tenth edition of Linné's *Systema Naturæ*. Consequently the actual generic names proposed by Moehring may be considered as introduced into zoology at that date, and are therefore not again available for use in other branches of zoology, even if they are not adopted by ornithologists.—E. A. SMITH.